

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH
CENTRAL DIVISION

<p>CIRO DARELLI, Plaintiff,</p> <p>vs.</p> <p>PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION, et al., Defendants.</p>	<p>MEMORANDUM DECISION AND ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO STRIKE</p> <p>Case No. 2:06-CV-354 TS</p>
--	--

Plaintiff moves to strike unspecified matters filed by Defendants in support of their Motion for Summary Judgment on the ground that it is "replete with inadmissible hearsay." Defendants oppose the Motion on the following grounds: (1) it fails to comply with the local rule requiring it to be supported by a memorandum; (2) it fails to identify the material it seeks to strike; and (3) the Declarations are admissible to show Defendants' perceptions of Plaintiff's job performance.


The Court agrees the Motion is so vague that it is not possible to determine the statements objected to, or the specific basis for any objection. The Court declines to

search the record in an effort to determine if there is an inadmissible hearsay in any of the materials supporting Plaintiff's Motion.¹ It is therefore

ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion to Strike (Docket No. 36) is DENIED.

DATED March 17, 2008.

BY THE COURT:



TED STEWART
United States District Judge

¹See, e.g., *Smith v. Cummings*, 445 F.3d 1254, 1261 (10th Cir. 2006) (declining to "consider on appeal factual allegations which are unsupported by citation to the record") (citing *Gross v. Burggraf Const. Co.* 53 F.3d 1531, 1546 (10th Cir. 1995) (same)).